

REMARKS

Amendments

Amendments to the Claims

Applicant has amended the claims to more particularly point out what Applicant regards as the invention. In particular, Applicant claims automatically launching an external application for a user in response to exportation of selected content and an augmentation associated with the content.

Rejections

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 1-4, 11-14, 21-24, 31 and 32

Claims 1-4, 11-14, 21-24, 31 and 32 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Cassorla et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,146,552, in view of Jain et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,597,980. Jain qualifies as prior art only under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) because it issued after Applicant's filing date. Applicant does not admit that Jain is prior art and reserves the right to challenge its designation as such at a later date. Nonetheless, Applicant respectfully submits that the combination of these two references does not teach each and every element of the rejected claims.

Cassorla discloses an electronic document application that enables a user to annotate an electronic document with notes and bookmarks. The annotations may be exported to a second user, who must manually initiate execution of the electronic document application to review the annotations. The second user may optionally further annotate the content.

Jain discloses cataloging video content according to predefined or user defined metadata. The cataloging system uses metadata to index and retrieve desired video clips. Furthermore, the cataloging system allows quick video retrieval by displaying hyperlinked frames of the video clips.

Independent claims 1, 11, 21, and 31, as amended, recite exporting a selected content with a content augmentation received from a user. Furthermore, the claims recite

launching an external application for the user in response to the data exportation. In contrast, Cassorla is directed towards exporting annotations and selected text to a second user and not for the same user as claimed. Furthermore, Cassorla discloses that a second user must manually initiate a program to review the annotations. Thus, Cassorla teaches away from the automatic launching of an application for the user and in response to the data exportation as claimed. In addition, because Jain is directed towards cataloging video, Jain does not teach or suggest launching an external application in response to the exportation of user augmentation and selected content as claimed.

Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claims 1, 11, 21, and 31 and claims 2-4, 12-14, 22-24, and 32 that depend from them are not rendered obvious by Cassorla and Jain under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a). Applicant respectfully requests the withdrawal of the rejection of the claims.

Claims 6, 7, 9, 10, 16, 17, 19, 20, 26, 27, 29, and 30

Claims 6, 7, 9, 10, 16, 17, 19, 20, 26, 27, 29, and 30 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cassorla, Jain, and Borman et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,890,172. Applicant respectfully submits that this combination does not teach each and every element of the invention as claimed in claims 6, 7, 9, 10, 16, 17, 19, 20, 26, 27, 29, and 30.

Claims 6, 7, 9, 10, 16, 17, 19, 20, 26, 27, 29, and 30 depend from one of independent claims 1, 11 and 21. Borman is directed toward using web site identifiers in a web page to retrieve information that is related to the web page. However, Borman does not teach or suggest launching an external application as claimed. Therefore, the combination of Cassorla and Borman cannot render obvious Applicant's invention as claimed in claims 6, 7, 9, 10, 16, 17, 19, 20, 26, 27, 29, and 30, and Applicant respectfully requests the withdrawal of the rejection of the claims under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over the combination.

Claims 8, 18 and 28

Claims 8, 18, and 28 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cassorla, Jain, Borman and Hansen et. al., U.S. Patent No. 6,442,144.

Applicant respectfully submits that this combination does not teach each and every limitation of Applicant's invention as claimed in claims 8, 18 and 28.

Claims 8, 18 and 28 depend from one of independent claims 1, 11 and 21. Hansen is directed toward creating a graphic representation of a network of devices. However, Hansen does not teach or suggest launching an external application as claimed. Therefore, the combination of Cassorla, Borman and Hansen cannot render obvious Applicant's invention as claimed in claims 68, 18 and 28, and Applicant respectfully requests the withdrawal of the rejection of the claims under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over the combination.

New Claims

New claims 35-37 have been added and claim an application launched in response to receiving an augmentation. Applicant respectfully submits claims 35-37 are allowable for at least the reasons set forth above for claims 1, 11, 21, and 31.

SUMMARY

Claims 1-4, 6-14, 16-24 and 26-37 are currently pending. In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully submits that the pending claims are in condition for allowance. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the application and allowance of the pending claims.

If the Examiner determines the prompt allowance of these claims could be facilitated by a telephone conference, the Examiner is invited to contact Eric Replogle at (408) 720-8300.

Deposit Account Authorization

Authorization is hereby given to charge our Deposit Account No. 02-2666 for any charges that may be due. Furthermore, if an extension is required, then Applicant hereby requests such extension.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR
& ZAFMAN LLP

Dated: 11/28, 2008



Eric S. Replogle
Registration No. 52,161

12400 Wilshire Boulevard
Seventh Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90025-1026
(408) 720-8300